

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Examiner's Office Action dated November 22, 2006. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and comments set forth below.

By this Amendment, claims 1-2 are amended and new claims 3-4 are added.

Accordingly, claims 1-4 are pending in the present application.

The specification was objected to because of minor grammatical informalities as noted in paragraph 3 of the Action. The foregoing amendments to the specification correct all the informalities noted by the undersign during a review of the specification. Thus, it is believed that the specification is grammatically correct and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Similarly, claim 1 was objected to because of grammatical informalities as explained in paragraph 4 of the Action. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the elements recited in the claim. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 was rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for the reason set forth in paragraph 5 of the Action. Claim 2 has been amended to positively recite "the light emitting diode", instead of luminescent diode. Accordingly, claim 2 is fully definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,864,860 to Manseth for the reasons given in paragraph 7 of the Action. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the "permanent magnet and the induction coil are detachably disposed in the interior of the plate". Support for this feature can be found on page 2, lines 7-3 and Figure 1 of the originally-filed specification. In view of this amendment, it is believed the rejection recited

in paragraph 7 of the Action is moot. The following remarks are presented to distinguish the claimed invention from Manseth.

Manseth is directed to an electrical apparatus for a ski where the generator assembly is mounted on the tail of the ski with a generator wheel (15) that contacts the snow surface. The generator assembly taught by Manseth requires an additional switch to either move the generator assembly into position or to turn on a battery charging unit 36 (via conductors 37, 38; contact means 40-41 and plates on the ski boot). See column 2, line 41 through column 3, line 8 of Manseth. As explained on page 2, lines 4-6 of the present invention, the luminescent ski according to the invention simply uses the motion or movement of the ski to generate the current and there is no need for an additional switch.

Manseth discloses a generator wheel that is disposed off the tail edge of the ski in order to generate electricity that moves along wire lead 23 from generator wheel 15 to the tail end of the ski of Manseth. Thus, Manseth does not disclose, teach or suggest a permanent magnet and induction coil that are detachably disposed in the interior of the plate forming the luminescent ski. Instead, Manseth teaches that the generator wheel is disposed outside the ski.

The Action acknowledges that Manseth “fails to teach that the generator includes a permanent magnet that rotates with the rotation wing and a coil in which the current is induced”. However, even if one of ordinary skill in the art were to construct a generator with a permanent magnet, rotation wing and induction coil, there is no motivation to move the same from off the tail edge of the ski as taught by Manseth. In addition to failing to teach that the permanent magnet and induction coil are detachably disposed in the interior of the ski, Manseth does not disclose a permanent magnet rotatably installed on a rotary shaft in an upper portion of the plate by a rotation wing. To the contrary, Manseth teaches a generator assembly off the tail of the ski and not

rotatably installed on a rotary shaft. Thus, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have considered modifying Manseth to have a permanent magnet and induction coil detachably disposed in the interior of the ski as Manseth teaches to generate electricity the generator wheel must be in contact with the surface of the snow field. Consequently, Manseth cannot render the claimed invention unpatentable and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 06-177027 to Takahashi in view of U.S. Patent NO. 5,455,485 to Kutter for the reasons set forth in paragraph 8 of the Action. This rejection is respectfully traversed.


Takihashi teaches a ski with LEDs for illuminating the ski. Kutter is directed to a bicycle lighting system employing a dynamo, propeller 3, electrical circuit 6, battery 4 and lighting devices 4. Based upon applicant's description of the invention in the present application, the Action asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art would have modified the power source of Takihashi to have the bicycle propeller dynamo as taught by Kutter. Applicant respectfully submits that the Action used a hindsight analysis based on Applicant's teachings, as there is no motivation to change the power source of Takihashi to that disclosed by Kutter. Takahashi is directed to an illuminated ski with a power source, while Kutter is directed a propeller powered lighting system on a bicycle. The art of skis and the art of bicycles are totally different and it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the ski art would not consider technology related to the bicycle art. Further it is unclear where either Takihashi or Kutter disclose that the permanent magnet and induction coil are detachably disposed in the interior of a ski. Kutter discloses that the propeller is at the front of the bicycle and thus, does not suggest placing the propeller in the interior of anything.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-4 are allowable over the prior art of record. Reconsideration of the application and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner is of the opinion that the prosecution of the application would be advanced by a personal interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 24, 2006


Catherine M. Voorhees
Registration No. 33,074
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998
Telephone: (202) 344-4000
Telefax: (202) 344-48300

CMV/elw
::ODMA\PCDOCS\DC2DOCS1\735087\1